

RICHARD P. BERG
HENRY KLEIN
MAVIS S. GALENSEN
M. IRIS NESS
JOHN A. PALMER
ROSS A. SCHMITT
KEVIN P. STEINMAN
GUANGYU TROY CAI
"OK BAR ONLY"
"NJ BAR ONLY"

ALESSANDRO STEINFEL
(EUROPEAN PATENT ATTORNEY)

OF COUNSEL
RICHARD M. JOHNSON
LAWRENCE S. COHEN
ROBIN DAY GLENN
KAM C. LOUIE
J. E. PHILLIPS
"OK BAR ONLY"

224 SOUTH MICHIGAN AVE
CHICAGO, IL 60604
RICHARD J. STREIT
FREDERICK W. MEYERS
DERMOT J. MORGAN
JOHN E. MCKEE
(MEMBERS IL BAR)



LAW OFFICES
LADAS & PARRY
5670 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
SUITE 2100
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90036-5679

TELEPHONE: (323) 934-2300
FACSIMILE: (323) 934-0202
E-MAIL: LA_Mail@ladasperry.com
INTERNET: http://www.ladas.com

May 16, 2002

REF ID: A12345
D.P. & R.F.
Room 307
#7 Reg for
Revd
07-29-02

26 WEST 61ST STREET
NEW YORK, NY 10023

STEPHEN A. GOLDSMITH
IAN JAY KALIFMAN
FREDERICK REICHWALD
JOSEPH H. HANDELMAN
ALLAN S. PILSON
PETER D. GALLOWAY
ROBERT ALPERT
JOHN RICHARDS
DANIEL F. ZENDEL
LANNING G. BRYER
WILLIAM R. EVANS
JANET L. CORD
CLIFFORD J. MASS
JOSEPH J. VILLAPOL
SHABATI BAKSHANI
DENNIS S. PRAHL
CYNTHIA R. MILLER
GEORGIA N. GOUNARIS
(MEMBER NY BAR)

52-54 HIGH HOLBORN
LONDON, WC1V 8RR, ENGLAND
IAN C. BAILIE
GRAHAM FARRINGTON
U.K. Resident Partner
(MEMBER NY BAR)
DACHAUERSTRASSE 37
80335 MUNICH, GERMANY

Customer Service Department
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Washington, D. C. 20231

Re: Our Monthly Deposit Account

Gentlemen:

We enclose herewith copies of our monthly deposit account statements for the months of January, February and March, 2002 and September and October 2001.

We are absolutely appalled at the number of \$180 charges which you have made against our account, apparently without proper authority.

These \$180 charges are apparently in connection with Information Disclosure Statements. If we send you an Information Disclosure Statement where we know there is a \$180 fee due, we do not debit our deposit account, but rather we send you a check in payment of the fee due. We tend to use our deposit account merely for emergency situations; for example, if we fail to send you a check or if the check becomes lost in your offices.

We have made a spot check of the cases for which the \$180 fee has been charged, and we have not found one in which a \$180 fee was due for filing the Information Disclosure Statement belatedly. Thus, it is our initial conclusion that these charges which were made to our deposit account were made erroneously and without our authorization.

As such, you are requested to immediately advise us for each \$180 fee charged to our account, why that fee was charged and, in particular, why the USPTO believes a fee was due. If the fee was not due, we expect these fees to be credited back immediately.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
May 16, 2002
Page 2

It is to be noted that there is no fee due in connection with an IDS if the IDS is filed before the first official action issues irrespective of the filing date of the application concerned.

Please advise when we can expect to have the unauthorized charges refunded to our account. Also, please explain yourselves, since we find your actions in making unauthorized charges to our deposit account to be, in a word, disgusting.

Very truly yours,

LADAS & PARRY

Richard Berg
Richard P. Berg

RPB:las
Enclosures